

CUBANS TALK OF CHANGES.

SOME DELEGATES NOW OPPOSED TO UNIVERSAL SUFFRAGE.

Others Say It Will Make No Difference, as Means Will Be Found to Suppress the Negro and Illiterate Vote—Planners Protest Against the Settlement of the Mortgage Question.

Special Cable Dispatch to THE SUN.

HAVANA, June 15.—Some of the delegates to the Constitutional Convention are considering the advisability of making an attempt to alter certain clauses of the Cuban Constitution, among others those referring to universal suffrage, the election of Governors of provinces, and the personal responsibility of the secretaries of the President for all their acts. They propose to substitute for the first two restricted suffrage and the nomination of Governors of provinces by central power and to abolish the third altogether. Opinion is divided at present as to the possibility of altering the Constitution, which itself says that this can be done only by Congress.

A majority of the delegates at present seem to be in favor of leaving the question of suffrage alone. Manuel Gómez says that in any case the local cliques will rule. With universal suffrage the people will be content, but they will not exercise any real power.

A radical delegate to the convention is quoted as saying "Better leave that question alone, as ways can be found to prevent the negroes and other illiterate portions of the population from voting."

Other delegates think the question a serious one, as universal suffrage will tend to mark the differences between the whites and blacks more than ever. It is said that this has already occurred in Santiago, where, although a few white leads the blacks, nevertheless parties are being formed on the color line.

The Planners' Association has published a protest against the decree which settled the mortgage question. The protest says, among other things: "We protest against said order, and if the opportunity comes some day when we can get redress for the damages said order will tell us what we will do."

The protest goes on to say that Cuba should be for Cubans, but Cuban lands will now pass into the hands of foreigners. The newspapers criticize the protest. The Lucha says the protest is made by bankrupts who expect special legislation artificially to protect them.

The Dario de la Marina says the decree is erred in not allowing the creditors to foreclose immediately. In regard to the threat of the planters to get redress later on, the paper says the Platt amendment protects the creditors and that the decree cannot be altered.

The Union Española says that this threat is one of many recently made by the Cubans to raze themselves on the Spaniards when the revolution begins. The paper adds that judges from the tops of the revolutionaries in the republic will soon end in anarchy. Discussing this topic the Dario de la Marina says the country is now in such a condition that if the government is handed over it will fall into the hands of the revolutionary extremists.

The quiet element shrinks from the idea of the American troops leaving, and it is probable that many so-called revolutionaries share the same feeling.

Delegate Alençon says the only way to save the republic is to have a strong man like Maximo Gomez, who will preserve the independence of the island as President. Otherwise, under the provisions of the Platt amendment, the Americans will intervene on the slightest pretext.

WANTS HUDSON COUNTY SHIP CANAL.

Bob Davis Would Enlarge Morris Canal to Join New York and Newark Bays.

Robert Davis, boss of the Democratic machine in Hudson County, said yesterday that he believes Newark and New York bays should be connected by a deep water canal running across the county. At present vessels are obliged to pass through the Kill van Kull into Newark Bay and up the Hackensack River in order to reach the meadow section west of Jersey City. A company was recently formed for the purpose of reclaiming the meadows, and Mr. Davis says that it may lend its assistance to secure a direct deep water canal.

Mr. Davis proposes, in case the Morris Canal and Banking Company succeed in getting a bill through the next Legislature authorizing the abandonment of the Morris Canal, that an effort be made to induce the United States Government to widen and dredge that portion of the canal running from a point near Newark Bay in Jersey City to "Fidler's Elbow," near New York Bay. He says that connection with the bays could be easily made, and the ship canal would be many miles shorter than the present course of vessels through the Kill van Kull.

Mr. Davis will try to enlist Congressman Allan L. McDermott in interesting the Government in the matter.

CANT OUT CORBIN EXECUTORS.

Mrs. Anna W. Corbin Borrowe Loses After Five Years' Litigation—Must Pay Costs.

BELLEVILLE, I. J., June 15.—After five years of litigation Mrs. Anna W. Corbin Borrowe, daughter of the late Austin Corbin, has been defeated in her efforts to oust the executors of her father's will, whom she accused of mismanaging the estate. A decision to this effect was entered in the Suffolk County Surrogate's Court this morning by Surrogate Robert Potts. The Surrogate's decision is a confirmation of the findings of Joseph M. Belford, who was appointed referee in the accounting. Referee Belford's work extended over three years and more than \$8,000 of testimony were taken. At the time of his death Mr. Corbin nominated the executors, who are Hiram C. Corbin, George S. Edell and Austin Corbin Jr., a nephew of the testator.

At the time of Mr. Corbin's death his estate was valued at \$60,000. Mr. Corbin's will provided that his entire estate, including his Long Island Railroad, had been disposed of for below par, and that the executors had profits to account for the value of the estate to the extent of more than a million dollars. She also set forth that several thousand dollars worth of stock in the Sunnyside and Belmont companies had been being carried at a great loss. Surrogate Potts upheld the executors against all of these charges.

In his opinion the Surrogate says: "No motive is shown for the alleged misdeeds of the executors, while it appears affirmatively that they were not guilty of malfeasance throughout by competent counsel and that they have each an interest at least as great as the testator in the safety of the testator and in his good will." The result of the decision is that the contestants for last year's opportunity for the offering of object is satisfactory, except that the executors have not yet obtained a position in which they have been placed.

It further appears that the executors have been compelled to sell off their property well and have brought forward their own private resources to save the estate when threatened with disaster.

In his opinion the Surrogate says: "No motive is shown for the alleged misdeeds of the executors, while it appears affirmatively that they were not guilty of malfeasance throughout by competent counsel and that they have each an interest at least as great as the testator in the safety of the testator and in his good will." The result of the decision is that the contestants for last year's opportunity for the offering of object is satisfactory, except that the executors have not yet obtained a position in which they have been placed.

It further appears that the executors have been compelled to sell off their property well and have brought forward their own private resources to save the estate when threatened with disaster.

In his opinion the Surrogate says: "No motive is shown for the alleged misdeeds of the executors, while it appears affirmatively that they were not guilty of malfeasance throughout by competent counsel and that they have each an interest at least as great as the testator in the safety of the testator and in his good will." The result of the decision is that the contestants for last year's opportunity for the offering of object is satisfactory, except that the executors have not yet obtained a position in which they have been placed.

It further appears that the executors have been compelled to sell off their property well and have brought forward their own private resources to save the estate when threatened with disaster.

In his opinion the Surrogate says: "No motive is shown for the alleged misdeeds of the executors, while it appears affirmatively that they were not guilty of malfeasance throughout by competent counsel and that they have each an interest at least as great as the testator in the safety of the testator and in his good will." The result of the decision is that the contestants for last year's opportunity for the offering of object is satisfactory, except that the executors have not yet obtained a position in which they have been placed.

It further appears that the executors have been compelled to sell off their property well and have brought forward their own private resources to save the estate when threatened with disaster.

In his opinion the Surrogate says: "No motive is shown for the alleged misdeeds of the executors, while it appears affirmatively that they were not guilty of malfeasance throughout by competent counsel and that they have each an interest at least as great as the testator in the safety of the testator and in his good will." The result of the decision is that the contestants for last year's opportunity for the offering of object is satisfactory, except that the executors have not yet obtained a position in which they have been placed.

It further appears that the executors have been compelled to sell off their property well and have brought forward their own private resources to save the estate when threatened with disaster.

In his opinion the Surrogate says: "No motive is shown for the alleged misdeeds of the executors, while it appears affirmatively that they were not guilty of malfeasance throughout by competent counsel and that they have each an interest at least as great as the testator in the safety of the testator and in his good will." The result of the decision is that the contestants for last year's opportunity for the offering of object is satisfactory, except that the executors have not yet obtained a position in which they have been placed.

It further appears that the executors have been compelled to sell off their property well and have brought forward their own private resources to save the estate when threatened with disaster.

In his opinion the Surrogate says: "No motive is shown for the alleged misdeeds of the executors, while it appears affirmatively that they were not guilty of malfeasance throughout by competent counsel and that they have each an interest at least as great as the testator in the safety of the testator and in his good will." The result of the decision is that the contestants for last year's opportunity for the offering of object is satisfactory, except that the executors have not yet obtained a position in which they have been placed.

It further appears that the executors have been compelled to sell off their property well and have brought forward their own private resources to save the estate when threatened with disaster.

In his opinion the Surrogate says: "No motive is shown for the alleged misdeeds of the executors, while it appears affirmatively that they were not guilty of malfeasance throughout by competent counsel and that they have each an interest at least as great as the testator in the safety of the testator and in his good will." The result of the decision is that the contestants for last year's opportunity for the offering of object is satisfactory, except that the executors have not yet obtained a position in which they have been placed.

It further appears that the executors have been compelled to sell off their property well and have brought forward their own private resources to save the estate when threatened with disaster.

In his opinion the Surrogate says: "No motive is shown for the alleged misdeeds of the executors, while it appears affirmatively that they were not guilty of malfeasance throughout by competent counsel and that they have each an interest at least as great as the testator in the safety of the testator and in his good will." The result of the decision is that the contestants for last year's opportunity for the offering of object is satisfactory, except that the executors have not yet obtained a position in which they have been placed.

It further appears that the executors have been compelled to sell off their property well and have brought forward their own private resources to save the estate when threatened with disaster.

In his opinion the Surrogate says: "No motive is shown for the alleged misdeeds of the executors, while it appears affirmatively that they were not guilty of malfeasance throughout by competent counsel and that they have each an interest at least as great as the testator in the safety of the testator and in his good will." The result of the decision is that the contestants for last year's opportunity for the offering of object is satisfactory, except that the executors have not yet obtained a position in which they have been placed.

It further appears that the executors have been compelled to sell off their property well and have brought forward their own private resources to save the estate when threatened with disaster.

In his opinion the Surrogate says: "No motive is shown for the alleged misdeeds of the executors, while it appears affirmatively that they were not guilty of malfeasance throughout by competent counsel and that they have each an interest at least as great as the testator in the safety of the testator and in his good will." The result of the decision is that the contestants for last year's opportunity for the offering of object is satisfactory, except that the executors have not yet obtained a position in which they have been placed.

It further appears that the executors have been compelled to sell off their property well and have brought forward their own private resources to save the estate when threatened with disaster.

In his opinion the Surrogate says: "No motive is shown for the alleged misdeeds of the executors, while it appears affirmatively that they were not guilty of malfeasance throughout by competent counsel and that they have each an interest at least as great as the testator in the safety of the testator and in his good will." The result of the decision is that the contestants for last year's opportunity for the offering of object is satisfactory, except that the executors have not yet obtained a position in which they have been placed.

It further appears that the executors have been compelled to sell off their property well and have brought forward their own private resources to save the estate when threatened with disaster.

In his opinion the Surrogate says: "No motive is shown for the alleged misdeeds of the executors, while it appears affirmatively that they were not guilty of malfeasance throughout by competent counsel and that they have each an interest at least as great as the testator in the safety of the testator and in his good will." The result of the decision is that the contestants for last year's opportunity for the offering of object is satisfactory, except that the executors have not yet obtained a position in which they have been placed.

It further appears that the executors have been compelled to sell off their property well and have brought forward their own private resources to save the estate when threatened with disaster.

In his opinion the Surrogate says: "No motive is shown for the alleged misdeeds of the executors, while it appears affirmatively that they were not guilty of malfeasance throughout by competent counsel and that they have each an interest at least as great as the testator in the safety of the testator and in his good will." The result of the decision is that the contestants for last year's opportunity for the offering of object is satisfactory, except that the executors have not yet obtained a position in which they have been placed.

It further appears that the executors have been compelled to sell off their property well and have brought forward their own private resources to save the estate when threatened with disaster.

In his opinion the Surrogate says: "No motive is shown for the alleged misdeeds of the executors, while it appears affirmatively that they were not guilty of malfeasance throughout by competent counsel and that they have each an interest at least as great as the testator in the safety of the testator and in his good will." The result of the decision is that the contestants for last year's opportunity for the offering of object is satisfactory, except that the executors have not yet obtained a position in which they have been placed.

It further appears that the executors have been compelled to sell off their property well and have brought forward their own private resources to save the estate when threatened with disaster.

In his opinion the Surrogate says: "No motive is shown for the alleged misdeeds of the executors, while it appears affirmatively that they were not guilty of malfeasance throughout by competent counsel and that they have each an interest at least as great as the testator in the safety of the testator and in his good will." The result of the decision is that the contestants for last year's opportunity for the offering of object is satisfactory, except that the executors have not yet obtained a position in which they have been placed.

It further appears that the executors have been compelled to sell off their property well and have brought forward their own private resources to save the estate when threatened with disaster.

In his opinion the Surrogate says: "No motive is shown for the alleged misdeeds of the executors, while it appears affirmatively that they were not guilty of malfeasance throughout by competent counsel and that they have each an interest at least as great as the testator in the safety of the testator and in his good will." The result of the decision is that the contestants for last year's opportunity for the offering of object is satisfactory, except that the executors have not yet obtained a position in which they have been placed.

It further appears that the executors have been compelled to sell off their property well and have brought forward their own private resources to save the estate when threatened with disaster.

In his opinion the Surrogate says: "No motive is shown for the alleged misdeeds of the executors, while it appears affirmatively that they were not guilty of malfeasance throughout by competent counsel and that they have each an interest at least as great as the testator in the safety of the testator and in his good will." The result of the decision is that the contestants for last year's opportunity for the offering of object is satisfactory, except that the executors have not yet obtained a position in which they have been placed.

It further appears that the executors have been compelled to sell off their property well and have brought forward their own private resources to save the estate when threatened with disaster.

In his opinion the Surrogate says: "No motive is shown for the alleged misdeeds of the executors, while it appears affirmatively that they were not guilty of malfeasance throughout by competent counsel and that they have each an interest at least as great as the testator in the safety of the testator and in his good will." The result of the decision is that the contestants for last year's opportunity for the offering of object is satisfactory, except that the executors have not yet obtained a position in which they have been placed.

It further appears that the executors have been compelled to sell off their property well and have brought forward their own private resources to save the estate when threatened with disaster.

In his opinion the Surrogate says: "No motive is shown for the alleged misdeeds of the executors, while it appears affirmatively that they were not guilty of malfeasance throughout by competent counsel and that they have each an interest at least as great as the testator in the safety of the testator and in his good will." The result of the decision is that the contestants for last year's opportunity for the offering of object is satisfactory, except that the executors have not yet obtained a position in which they have been placed.

It further appears that the executors have been compelled to sell off their property well and have brought forward their own private resources to save the estate when threatened with disaster.

In his opinion the Surrogate says: "No motive is shown for the alleged misdeeds of the executors, while it appears affirmatively that they were not guilty of malfeasance throughout by competent counsel and that they have each an interest at least as great as the testator in the safety of the testator and in his good will." The result of the decision is that the contestants for last year's opportunity for the offering of object is satisfactory, except that the executors have not yet obtained a position in which they have been placed.

It further appears that the executors have been compelled to sell off their property well and have brought forward their own private resources to save the estate when threatened with disaster.

In his opinion the Surrogate says: "No motive is shown for the alleged misdeeds of the executors, while it appears affirmatively that they were not guilty of malfeasance throughout by competent counsel and that they have each an interest at least as great as the testator in the safety of the testator and in his good will." The result of the decision is that the contestants for last year's opportunity for the offering of object is satisfactory, except that the executors have not yet obtained a position in which they have been placed.

It further appears that the executors have been compelled to sell off their property well and have brought forward their own private resources to save the estate when threatened with disaster.

In his opinion the Surrogate says: "No motive is shown for the alleged misdeeds of the executors, while it appears affirmatively that they were not guilty of malfeasance throughout by competent counsel and that they have each an interest at least as great as the testator in the safety of the testator and in his good will." The result of the decision is that the contestants for last year's opportunity for the offering of object is satisfactory, except that the executors have not yet obtained a position in which they have been placed.

It further appears that the executors have been compelled to sell off their property well and have brought forward their own private resources to save the estate when threatened with disaster.

In his opinion the Surrogate says: "No motive is shown for the alleged misdeeds of the executors, while it appears affirmatively that they were not guilty of malfeasance throughout by competent counsel and that they have each an interest at least as great as the testator in the safety of the testator and in his good will." The result of the decision is that the contestants for last year's opportunity for the offering of object is satisfactory, except that the executors have not yet obtained a position in which they have been placed.

It further appears that the executors have been compelled to sell off their property well and have brought forward their own private resources to save the estate when threatened with disaster.

In his opinion the Surrogate says: "No motive is shown for the alleged misdeeds of the executors, while it appears affirmatively that they were not guilty of malfeasance throughout by competent counsel and that they have each an interest at least as great as the testator in the safety of the testator and in his good will." The result of the decision is that the contestants for last year's opportunity for the offering of object is satisfactory, except that the executors have not yet obtained a position in which they have been placed.

It further appears that the executors have been compelled to sell off their property well and have brought forward their own private resources to save the estate when threatened with disaster.

In his opinion the Surrogate says: "No motive is shown for the alleged misdeeds of the executors, while it appears affirmatively that they were not guilty of malfeasance throughout by competent counsel and that they have each an interest at least as great as the testator in the safety of the testator and in his good will." The result of the decision is that the contestants for last year's opportunity for the offering of object is satisfactory, except that the executors have not yet obtained a position in which they have been placed.

It further appears that the executors have been compelled to sell off their property well and have brought forward their own private resources to save the estate when threatened with disaster.

In his opinion the Surrogate says: "No motive is shown for the alleged misdeeds of the executors, while it appears affirmatively that they were not guilty of malfeasance throughout by competent counsel and that they have each an interest at least as great as the testator in the safety of the testator and in his good will." The result of the decision is that the contestants for last year's opportunity for the offering of object is satisfactory, except that the executors have not yet obtained a position in which they have been placed.

It further appears that the executors have been compelled to sell off their property well and have brought forward their own private resources to save the estate when threatened with disaster.